

controlling means for controlling display of the
ID data on the basis of a judgement result of the judging
means. --.

REMARKS

Claim 47 has been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 32-38 and 45-48 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 5,719,984 taken in view of the Shimada, et al. patent. The Examiner has further rejected applicants' claims 32-37 and 45-48 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by the Shimada, et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As stated in applicants' previous Amendment, applicants' independent claim 32 recites a reproducing apparatus including a display mode setting means. This means controls the amount of reproduced data signals to be displayed and has first and second modes involving respective different display amounts. A data signal converting and supplying means converts the reproduced data signals into character signals for supply to a monitor and under control of the display mode setting means supplies the character signals to the monitor in respective different amounts.

Such a construction is not taught or suggested by claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent. These claims are directed to

a recording device not a reproducing device and suggest nothing regarding a reproducing device. Moreover, applicants disagree with the Examiner's arguments regarding the Shimada, et al. patent.

More particularly, the Examiner has attempted to equate the reproduction of the signals with different ID codes in the Shimada, et al. patent to applicants' claimed display mode setting means and applicants' data signal converting and supply means. However, in the Shimada, et al. patent these codes are set during recording and there is no mechanism in the reproduction system to set display modes. The Shimada, et al. patent, thus, does not teach a reproducing apparatus which includes a mode setting means. Applicants' claim 32, and its respective dependent claims therefore patentably distinguish over claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the Shimada, et al. patent and over the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone.

Applicants' independent claim 47 has been amended to better define applicants' invention. Claim 47 now recites that the judging means judges whether the ID recorded data is effective or null when the image data is reproduced and the control of the display of the ID data is based on this judgement.

Again, claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent are directed solely to a recording device and not a reproducing device and suggest nothing regarding reproduction, let alone judging

whether recorded ID data is effective or null when image data is reproduced. Here again, the Examiner has attempted to equate the reproduction operation based on the ID codes in the Shimada, et al. patent to the applicants' claimed judging operation.

Applicants note, however, that in the Shimada, et al. patent, there is only a reading or detection of an ID code, i.e., either the code 11, 01 and 10 is detected or read. Therefore, there is only a determination as to whether a particular code is present. There is, thus, no judgement as to whether a code is effective or null.

Accordingly, the detection of the ID codes in the Shimada, et al. patent does not, in fact, equate, to the judging means in applicants' amended claim 47. Such claim, and its respective dependent claim, thus patentably distinguish over claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the Shimada, et al. patent and over the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone .

Finally, applicants' independent claim 45 requires, in a reproduction apparatus, that a display means be controlled to change the display position of a character image depending upon whether the first identification signal is reproduced alone or with the second identification information. Again, applicants' submit that this construction is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

In particular, as previously stated, claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent are directed to a recording device not a reproducing device and suggest nothing regarding a reproducing device. Moreover, applicants disagree with the Examiner's arguments that the detection of the ID codes in the Shimada, et al. result in the control of a display as required by applicants' claim 45.

In the Shimada, et al. patent, there is no teaching that there be a change in the display position, depending upon which of the ID codes is detected, let alone that this be dependent on whether one code or more than one code is detected. In point of fact, in the Shimada, et al. patent, only one ID code accompanies a signal and, therefore, there is no case where two codes are detected.


Independent claim 45, and its dependent claims, thus patentably distinguish over claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the Shimada, et al. patent and over the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants note also that applicants have filed concurrently herewith a Notice of Appeal to maintain the application pending, while the Examiner considers the subject

Amendment. Additionally, applicants have filed herewith a request for a telephone interview asking that the Examiner telephone applicants' undersigned attorney to discuss this Amendment if the Examiner is still not disposed to allow the application.

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
Filed Under § 1.34(a)

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 682-9640
November 10, 2000